

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/541,399	07/01/2005	Sang-Hyeon Kim	P2947US00	6318	
58927 7590 03/31/2010 H.C. PARK & ASSOCIATES, PLC			EXAMINER		
8500 LEESBURG PIKE			SCOTT, RANDY A		
SUITE 7500 VIENNA, VA 22182			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	22102		2453	•	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/31/2010	FLECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATENT@PARK-LAW.COM

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/541,399	KIM, SANG-HYEON		
Examiner	Art Unit		
RANDY SCOTT	2453		

	RANDY SCOTT	2453					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 02 March 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropriate	extension fee				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (5) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the proof of the	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to     (a) They raise new issues that would require further corresponds to the contract of the c	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
<ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown)         (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or     </li> </ul>		lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orrosponding number of finding roje	otou olamio.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving.</li> </ol>		be entered and an ex	planation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 8-16, 39-41, 43-45, and 47-54.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hafara ar an the data of Elina a Nie	tion of Annualill not	he entered				
<ul> <li>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o							
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement(s)</i> . (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/RANDY SCOTT/ Examiner, Art Unit 2453						
	Examiner, Art Unit 2455						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the applicant's argument that Carmel does not divide a block of streaming data into a plurality of sub blocks:

Col. 3, lines 30-40 of Carmel, teaches dividing data streams into a sequence of time slices for individual download of each slice at a predefined data rate upon being transmitted to the specified recipient. Carmel also provides language for monityring transmitted transmission state (see col. 9, lines 31-34, which discloses monitoring the data rate of the transmitted data). Carmel also provides languages that anticipates the applicant's limitation of redistributing said sub blocks of a bad connection to other node for download if one of said established connections is determined to be the bad connection based on said monitored download state (see col. 10 of carmel, lines 10-14, which teaches retransmission due to broken links)

In response to the applicant's argument that the office action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness regarding the rejection over Carmel in view of Yao:

Rejecting said claims under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Carmel et al (US 6,389,473) in view of Yao et al (US 5,956,321) is relied upon in the fact that one would motivated to incorporate Yao in order to provide the benefit of transferring streaming data broken down into allocated portions in specified time solts, which is also supported by the lanquage taught within Carmel.